

Durham Research Online

Deposited in DRO:

09 October 2017

Version of attached file:

Accepted Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Kitchener, B.G.B. and Wainwright, J. and Parsons, A.J. (2017) 'A review of the principles of turbidity measurement.', *Progress in physical geography*, 41 (5). pp. 620-642.

Further information on publisher's website:

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0309133317726540>

Publisher's copyright statement:

Kitchener, B.G.B., Wainwright, J. and Parsons, A.J. (2017) 'A review of the principles of turbidity measurement.', *Progress in physical geography*, 41 (5). pp. 620-642. © 2017 The Author(s). Reprinted by permission of SAGE Publications.

Additional information:

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

A review of the principles of turbidity measurement

Journal:	<i>Progress in Physical Geography</i>
Manuscript ID	PPG-16-069.R1
Manuscript Type:	Main Article
Keywords:	Turbidity, Suspended Sediment, Sediment Transport, Instrumentation, Methodology, Mie Theory, Turbidity Standards, Suspended Solids
Abstract:	<p>Turbidity of water due to the presence suspended sediment is measured and interpreted in a variety of ways, which can lead to the misinterpretation of data. This paper re-examines the physics of light-scattering in water, and exposes the extent to which the reporting of turbidity data is inconsistent. It is proposed that the cause of this inconsistency is the fact that the accepted turbidity standards USEPA Method 180.1, ISO 7027 and GLI Method 2 are mutually inconsistent, as these standards give rise to a large number of measurement units that are not based on the optical properties of light absorption and scattering by suspensions in water, but by the arbitrary definition of the degree of turbidity being due to a concentration of formazin or other similar polymer-based calibration standard. It is then proposed that all turbidity-measuring devices should be calibrated with precise optical attenuators such as ND filters. Such calibration would allow for the definition of a beam attenuation coefficient (BAC) for every turbidity measuring instrument which would be cross-comparable with any other instrument calibrated in the same way. The units for turbidity measurements should be based on attenuation and reported as dB m⁻¹. It is also proposed that a new standard should be drafted according to this attenuation-based method, and this new standard should also define the nomenclature for reporting data collected at any specific scattering angle in terms of an attenuation in dB m⁻¹. The importance of multi-parameter turbidity measurements for the improvement of the quality of turbidity data, and the application of parameter-rich data sets to new methods of sediment characterization are discussed. It is suggested that more research into multi-parameter turbidity measurements is needed, as these new methods will facilitate an increase in parity between turbidity and suspended sediment concentration (SSC), a relationship that is subjective.</p>

Turbidity of water due to the presence suspended sediment is measured and interpreted in a variety of ways, which can lead to the misinterpretation of data. This paper re-examines the physics of light-scattering in water, and exposes the extent to which the reporting of turbidity data is inconsistent. It is proposed that the cause of this inconsistency is the fact that the accepted turbidity standards USEPA Method 180.1, ISO 7027 and GLI Method 2 are mutually inconsistent, as these standards give rise to a large number of measurement units that are not based on the optical properties of light absorption and scattering by suspensions in water, but by the arbitrary definition of the degree of turbidity being due to a concentration of formazin or other similar polymer-based calibration standard. It is then proposed that all turbidity-measuring devices should be calibrated with precise optical attenuators such as ND filters. Such calibration would allow for the definition of a beam attenuation coefficient (BAC) for every turbidity measuring instrument which would be cross-comparable with any other instrument calibrated in the same way. The units for turbidity measurements should be based on attenuation and reported as dB m^{-1} . It is also proposed that a new standard should be drafted according to this attenuation-based method, and this new standard should also define the nomenclature for reporting data collected at any specific scattering angle in terms of an attenuation in dB m^{-1} . The importance of multi-parameter turbidity measurements for the improvement of the quality of turbidity data, and the application of parameter-rich data sets to new methods of sediment characterization are discussed. It is suggested that more research into multi-parameter turbidity measurements is needed, as these new methods will facilitate an increase in parity between turbidity and suspended sediment concentration (SSC), a relationship that is subjective.

Abstract

Turbidity of water due to the presence suspended sediment is measured and interpreted in a variety of ways, which can lead to the misinterpretation of data. This paper re-examines the physics of light-scattering in water, and exposes the extent to which the reporting of turbidity data is inconsistent. It is proposed that the cause of this inconsistency is the fact that the accepted turbidity standards USEPA Method 180.1, ISO 7027 and GLI Method 2 are mutually inconsistent, as these standards give rise to a large number of measurement units that are not based on the optical properties of light absorption and scattering by suspensions in water, but by the arbitrary definition of the degree of turbidity being due to a concentration of formazin or other similar polymer-based calibration standard. It is then proposed that all turbidity-measuring devices should be calibrated with precise optical attenuators such as ND filters. Such calibration would allow for the definition of a beam attenuation coefficient (BAC) for every turbidity measuring instrument which would be cross-comparable with any other instrument calibrated in the same way. The units for turbidity measurements should be based on attenuation and reported as dB m^{-1} . It is also proposed that a new standard should be drafted according to this attenuation-based method, and this new standard should also define the nomenclature for reporting data collected at any specific scattering angle in terms of an attenuation in dB m^{-1} . The importance of multi-parameter turbidity measurements for the improvement of the quality of turbidity data, and the application of parameter-rich data sets to new methods of sediment characterization are discussed. It is suggested that more research into multi-parameter turbidity measurements is needed, as these new methods will facilitate an increase in parity between turbidity and suspended sediment concentration (SSC), a relationship that is subjective.

Key words

Turbidity; Suspended Sediment; Sediment Transport

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

24 **Introduction**

25 The term “turbidity” is used widely throughout the physical sciences, and is interpreted in different
26 ways in different contexts. It is commonly used to describe the optical clarity of a fluid (for example,
27 the atmosphere), but for the purposes of this paper it refers to another common usage of the term
28 which is the optical clarity of water. The presence of suspended particulates, dissolved inorganic
29 chemical species, organic matter content and temperature can all affect the turbidity of a body of
30 water. Investigators from different fields (waste water treatment; drinking water quality; forestry;
31 civil engineering, aquaculture and ecology), and from the sub-disciplines within physical geography
32 (fluvial; marine; glacial; coastal and estuarial) use turbidity measurement as a surrogate relative
33 indicator of some other physical property, typically suspended sediment concentration (SSC) or total
34 suspended solids (TSS). The amount of literature available on the subject of water turbidity is large,
35 and a number of reviews have already been undertaken by investigators from some of the sub-
36 disciplinary groups (Bilotta & Brazier 2008; Davies-Colley & Smith 2001; Kerr 1995; Ziegler 2003).
37 There is however, some disagreement about what turbidity actually *means*, partly due to the
38 different sub-disciplinary contexts in which the term is used, and partly because of the way in which
39 the various measurement standards are assumed to be based on a correct *a priori* understanding of
40 the physical processes of light-scattering and absorption.

41 Why is turbidity measurement important? The answer to this question depends on the
42 perspective of the investigator. Some researchers are purely interested in the effect that the
43 attenuation of light has on, for example, aquatic ecosystems, so that knowledge of the mass
44 concentration of the suspended particles is not always the primary concern. In this case other
45 parameters of interest include the reduction of visual range in water (affecting the ability of
46 predators to hunt), and the amount of light available for photosynthesis (Bilotta & Brazier 2008).
47 Other investigators are concerned directly with the study of sediment-transport processes, in which
48 case knowledge of the mass concentration of the suspended particles and other parameters such as

the particle-size distribution (PSD) is highly desirable for a number of reasons. Turbidity measurement is important in this context, as although the turbidity measurement itself is heavily biased by the PSD (Gippel 1989), it is not specifically designed to provide detailed information about the PSD. For example, knowledge of particle size is important as the transport of fine sediment derived from different land uses through catchments will impact directly on ecosystem services, such as the provision of drinking water. Fine sediment delivery into river systems is also known to cause problems such as irritation to fish gills whilst it is in suspension (Davies-Colley & Smith 2001). Bilotta & Brazier (2008) summarize the effects of what they refer to as suspended solids (SS) on periphyton and macrophytes, invertebrates and salmonid fish species. The displacement of many fish species can often be due to an increase in turbidity caused by the cumulative effects of fine sediment introduced into the riparian environment as a direct result of human activities such as deforestation (Kerr 1995), or by natural events such as sediment-transport by stormwater runoff. The use of turbidity measurement as a surrogate indicator for parameters such as suspended sediment concentration has been explored by many researchers, as reviewed by Ziegler (2003). It has been shown that the particle size distribution (PSD) of a homogenous sediment can vary temporally from its source (e.g. hillslope runoff) as it is transported through a catchment into a stream, due to a variation in the relative proportion of aggregates (flocs) present in the measured flux (Slattery & Burt 1997). Therefore knowledge of how the PSD varies dynamically in this fluvial context due to a variability in the degree of flocculation (DOF) is important for the study of the transport processes of both sediment and organic species in flocs (Williams et al. 2007). There is clearly some variation in the importance given to the parameters of turbidity by the different disciplinary groups, and so the aim of this paper is to evaluate how relevant turbidity measurement is to the study of sediment-transport processes specifically, and to propose methods for the improvement of the measurement and reporting of turbidity in a general context. The steps required to achieve this evaluation are given by the following list of objectives:

- 1
- 2
3741. To analyse critically the measurement methodologies described in the literature
- 4
- 575including any inconsistencies in nomenclature of measurement principles.
- 6
7762. To review briefly the physics of light absorption and scattering processes in water in
- 8
- 977order to provide an underpinning for the discussion of the definition of terms
- 10
- 1178according to various investigators from different sub-disciplinary groups.
- 12
13793. To present a critique of the measurement units, calibration methods and standards
- 14
- 1580applicable to the measurement of turbidity, SSC and TSS, and to examine of the
- 16
- 1781origins of the relationship between turbidity measurements and the implied
- 18
- 1982properties of suspended sediment. This step is vital because the cross-comparability
- 20
- 2183of turbidity data obtained in the field is often invalid due to a widespread reliance on
- 22
- 2384the assumed integrity of Formazin calibration methods.
- 24
25854. To propose, based on objective 3, that a new turbidity instrumentation standard is
- 26
- 2786required, and to describe its fundamental content.
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31

3287

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

Turbidity measurement principles and nomenclature

The measurement of turbidity is split into two basic methodologies: *turbidimetry*, in which the degree of *transmission* of light is determined, and *nephelometry*, in which the degree of light-scattering is evaluated (see reviews by Ziegler, 2003 and Lawler, 2005). This division has its roots in the mathematical descriptions employed to model the various phenomena. In the case of turbidimetry, the appropriate theories are due to Beer (1852) and Lambert (1760) ; as for nephelometry, many theories and models have been developed to describe a range of scattering processes, and these models are mostly derived from Mie theory (Mie 1908). Nephelometry itself is sub-divided into three further categories which are *forward-scattering*, *side-scattering* and *back-scattering*. Side-scattering is generally accepted to be a measurement angle of 90° to the incident beam, although the existing standards impose different upper and lower bounds on that value (Table 3). Forward-scattering (0°< ϑ <90°) and Back-scattering (90°< ϑ <180°, often referred to as

99 *optical back-scattering* or *OBS*) however, do not have a well-defined relative measurement angle.
100 Different instruments employ different measurement angles, and these values are not always
101 reported.

[Insert Figure 1.]

103 Before continuing with the discussion another ambiguity in terminology must be addressed. The
104 definition of the scattering angle in terms of where the 0° position is located spatially also varies
105 throughout the literature (Table 1). For example in some cases a forward-scattering angle is stated,
106 which *implies* that the transmitted (direct) beam is located at 0° (Agrawal et al., 2008 and Jansson,
107 1992). Contradictory to this position, Bilro et al. (2010) define the transmitted beam as being located
108 at the 180° position. In one instance two contradictory diagrams are presented in the same paper
109 (Sadar 2004, pp.8-9), and in many other cases the scattering-regime nomenclature is not associated
110 with a specific scattering angle (e.g. Fugate & Friedrichs, 2002).

111 The interpretation that is adopted throughout this paper is that the scattering-angle is
112 specified in terms of a detector placed at a position with respect to the incident beam *after* a
113 physical interaction has occurred in the sample, i.e. the direct beam detector is placed at the 0°
114 position (denoting “pure” attenuation measurement), forward-scattering detectors are placed
115 anywhere from $0^\circ < \vartheta < 90^\circ$, a side-scattering detector is placed at exactly 90° , and back-scattering
116 detectors are placed at $90^\circ < \vartheta \leq 180^\circ$.

[Insert Table 1]

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

118 **The physics of light absorption and scattering through turbid water**

119 **A brief review of optical theories**

120 To understand the physics of light scattering by particles suspended in water, it is necessary to have
121 some knowledge of the mathematical models employed to describe the various absorption and
122 scattering processes. Fundamental theory and mathematical model development are continually
123 progressing in this area, but the basic points of interest pertinent to the understanding of turbidity in
124 water for the practical investigator are summarised in this section. Three main theories are
125 discussed: Rayleigh theory, Mie theory and geometric optics. Also discussed are two theories that
126 can be considered as approximations to Mie theory for specific conditions. These are the *Fraunhofer*
127 *diffraction* theory (FDT) and the *Anomalous diffraction* theory (ADT) of Van De Hulst (1957). The
128 reason that these two theories are considered here is that they both yield computationally fast
129 algorithms that are utilised by laser-based particle-sizing instruments. These instruments are used
130 widely in suspended particle analysis (organic and inorganic) both *in situ* and off-line in laboratories,
131 and are extensively employed for suspended sediment characterization.

132

133 **Rayleigh and Mie scattering**

134 The third Baron Rayleigh formulated his scattering theory to account for the blue colour of the sky
135 (Strutt 1871). Rayleigh scattering involves particles that are much smaller than the wavelength of the
136 incident light, and are also defined as being *optically soft* – meaning that the particles are limited to
137 having a refractive index very close to 1 (air molecules in the case of Rayleigh’s model). Rayleigh
138 demonstrated that scattering from small particles is strongly wavelength dependent in favour of the
139 shorter wavelengths and is spatially isometric (i.e. scattered equally in all directions), hence the blue
140 colour of the sky. He determined that this blue colour is predominant because the scattered light
141 intensity is inversely proportional to the fourth power of the incident light wavelength, i.e. the

1
2
3 142 shorter wavelengths of light (e.g. blue end of the visible spectrum) are scattered more readily than
4
5 143 the longer wavelengths of light (e.g. red end of the visible spectrum).
6
7

8 144 Gustav Mie originally developed his theory to explain the colouration of metals in the
9
10 145 colloidal state (Mie 1908). Mie theory successfully explains the dominance of forward scattering
11
12 146 where particles are of a similar size to or larger than the incident wavelength of light, unlike the case
13
14 147 of isotropic scattering of light by much smaller particles as in Rayleigh scattering.
15
16

17
18 148 In order to get some sense of the particle size ranges that are applicable to the different
19
20 149 scattering regimes it is first necessary to define the *dimensionless size parameter* x ,
21

22
23 150
$$x = \frac{2 \pi r}{\lambda} \quad (1)$$

24
25

26 151 where r is the spherical particle radius [m] and λ is the wavelength of the incident light [m]. Figure 2
27
28 152 shows how the forward-lobed nature of a set of light intensity distribution functions develops as x
29
30 153 increases from 0.1 to 10. These spatial intensity distribution functions are also known as *scattering*
31
32 154 *phase functions*, which are calculated using Mie theory.
33
34

35
36 155 [insert Figure 2.]
37

38 156 Geometric optics

39
40

41
42 157 Geometric optics, otherwise known as ray optics, describes the light traversing a medium in terms of
43
44 158 a straight path (hence “ray”). It explains *refraction*, in which there is a change in direction of a light
45
46 159 ray at the interface between two regions with differing refractive indices. It also accounts for
47
48 160 *reflection* and *absorption*, and is best applied in situations where the wavelength of light is much less
49
50 161 than the size of the scattering particle. Figure 3 depicts a simplified diagram of scattering and
51
52 162 absorption processes of a particle suspended in water as viewed from the perspective of ray optics.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

163

[insert Figure 3.]

164

Fraunhofer diffraction theory (FDT)

165

Fraunhofer diffraction occurs at small angles to the forward-scattered beam, i.e. <30°. Under these

166

conditions of wavelength and scattering angle, FDT is a useful approximation to Mie theory, and is

167

popular due to the relative simplicity of its algorithms. Due to the wavelength and particle size

168

restrictions FDT cannot be applied to sub-micron sized particles. For example, the smallest sized

169

sediment particle that could exhibit Fraunhofer diffraction when illuminated by a beam of red light

170

(wavelength 630 nm) would be 6.3 µm, i.e. well above the sub-micron size limit.

171

172

Anomalous diffraction theory (ADT)

173

ADT (Van De Hulst 1957) is a computationally efficient method by which the scattering from small

174

particles can be modelled. The caveat is that the particles must be *optically soft* as in Rayleigh

175

scattering (i.e. they must have a refractive index close to 1), and they must also have a large size

176

parameter $x \gg 1$.

177

178

The single scattering albedo

179

The single scattering albedo, denoted ω , is a useful unitless quantity defined as the ratio of

180

scattering efficiency to total extinction efficiency. If the attenuation observed by a detector placed in

181

the “direct beam” configuration as in Figure 1 was due entirely to absorption, then $\omega = 0$. When the

182

observed attenuation is due to scattering processes alone, then $\omega = 1$. The scattering albedo is useful

183

when describing the particle size range that can be effectively modelled by the various regimes

184

(Rayleigh, Mie etc.). A graph of scattering albedo (ω) versus size parameter (x) is presented by

185

Moosmüller & Arnott (2009, Fig.1, p.1031), which shows the particle size ranges covered by Rayleigh

186 and Mie theory for particles with a refractive index of 1.55 (similar to that of silica). On this graph,
 187 the approximate scattering-model regime boundaries are observed, as shown in Figure 4. The *large*
 188 *particle limit* of Mie theory is also shown, and the size parameter at which Mie theory converges
 189 with this limit is the point at which geometric optics (not shown on the graph) becomes an
 190 alternative scattering model (at $x \approx 2000$).

191 Light absorption and scattering by suspensions in water

192 In the terminology of physical optics absorption is a *non-parametric* process, i.e. one that is
 193 inherently lossy – meaning that energy is dissipated in the absorbing medium. The *parametric*
 194 processes that are to be considered do not involve any imparting of energy to the physical system
 195 through which the radiation is traversing, i.e. the wavelength of the scattered light is not altered
 196 (elastic scattering). The pertinence of these (and other) theories to the study of suspended particles
 197 in general, and suspended sediment specifically, must be considered. Rayleigh theory is applicable to
 198 small, non-absorbing (dielectric) spherical particles. Mie theory is the most ubiquitous of the models
 199 that is applied to the study of light scattering by suspensions in water. It represents a general
 200 solution to scattering from absorbing or non-absorbing spherical particles, with no limits on particle
 201 size. Rayleigh theory is less complex to apply than Mie theory, but is limited to small particles. The
 202 dimensionless size parameter x (Equation 1) for the scattering regimes, and the equivalent
 203 approximate particle size ranges are:

204	$x \ll 1$	Rayleigh scattering	(2 nm to 75 nm)
205	$x \cong 1$	Mie scattering	(20 nm to 765 μm)
206	$x \gg 1$	Geometric optics	(>200 μm)

207 The graph of wavelength vs. particle diameter (Figure 4) shows the accepted boundaries
 208 between the various scattering regimes, as adapted from Lelli (2014) and confirmed by Moosmüller

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

& Arnott (2009). Also plotted on the graph are the clastic sediment size ranges that are of interest in this paper.

[insert Figure 4.]

Interpretation of this plot must however be considered carefully, as the data it represents are limited to a *single scattering event* from a *purely spherical* particle. The regime boundaries located at $x=0.02$, $x=0.2$ and $x=2000$ (Lelli 2014 and Moosmüller & Arnott (2009) are not strict demarcation lines (i.e. Mie theory includes Rayleigh theory as $x \rightarrow 0$), but are there to suggest the generally accepted view of where the various models are used with respect to particle size parameter x . These boundaries should be considered to be somewhat blurred when applied to multiple-scattering from non-homogenous suspended sediment particles. Considerable model development is needed to account for scattering from large, non-spherical sediment particles. This work will lead to a redefinition of the scattering regime boundaries as depicted in Figure 4, with new models specific to suspended sediment being represented on the graph. There would also be one omission from the graph, namely Rayleigh scattering. As far as light scattering from suspended sediment is concerned, this theory has no application due to the restrictions in particle size (i.e. very small: < 76.4 nm) and refractive index (i.e. $n \approx 1$). Although Mie theory is limited to small, spherical particles only, it has many extensions that describe much more complex scattering regimes (including multiple-scattering and scattering from small non-spherical particles), and also simpler scattering regimes such as FDT (valid for particle diameter $d \geq 10 \lambda$, and scattering angle $\vartheta \leq 30^\circ$). Other theories such as ADT which as with Rayleigh theory was originally designed for optically soft particles (but in this case with a large x value), are also adaptable to cope with higher refractive indices and non-spherical particles (Liu et al. 1998).

There is clearly a need to find a light-scattering model framework that is consistent with both small and large particle scattering, and which is also extensible to many-particle analysis. In the case of back-scattering from suspended sediment it has been shown that the reflectivity of the

sediment also has a direct effect on the scattered light intensity (Sutherland et al. 2000), suggesting that geometric optics may play a part in future model development. Without a comprehensive understanding of the complex manner by which particle size, shape and concentration affect the absorption and scattering of light, it will not be possible to interpret what a turbidity measurement actually means.

The definition of the beam attenuation coefficient.

The attenuation coefficient Σ is commonly referred to as the *beam attenuation coefficient* (BAC) in the turbidity literature, but these two quantities are defined in different ways by different authors. It is important that the ambiguities in both the definition and application of the BAC as a method for comparing turbidity data obtained by different methods are appreciated, as these ambiguities can lead to the misinterpretation of that data. The following discussion focusses on how the *a priori* Σ is defined, and then leads on to a definition of the BAC as an expression of Σ in terms of observable quantities, i.e. a *measured* attenuation and the *optical path-length* of the measurement instrument.

The attenuation coefficient Σ

Light is absorbed by water and this absorption is a function of the wavelength of the incident light (Figure 5). The strongest absorption occurs at a wavelength of $\lambda = 417.5\text{nm}$ (Pope & Fry 1997) which gives a maximum reduction in transmitted light intensity of 0.05% over a distance of 0.1 m, which is the typical limit to the optical path length of existing turbidity instruments. As this is the worst-case scenario, the absorption of light by water is considered to be negligible in the context of turbidity measurement.

[insert Figure 5.]

Light is also absorbed by any other material that may be suspended in the water. In order to determine practically a value for absorption it is necessary to measure the amount of light

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

258 transmitted through a given sample of water. This is termed the transmittance, T , which is defined
259 as the ratio of the transmitted light intensity I to the light source intensity I_0 , and has units of Wm^{-2} .
260 The transmittance is also related to the optical depth (Equation 2), τ (effectively the opacity of the
261 medium), and the *absorbance*, A :

262
$$T = \frac{I}{I_0} = e^{-\tau} = 10^{-A} \quad (2)$$

263 A quantitative measure of the optical depth τ can be expressed in terms of the natural logarithm of
264 the transmittance or in terms of the absorbance (Equation 3). This in turn leads to a definition of
265 absorbance with units of the Neper (Equation 4), or in terms of the base-ten logarithm (Equation 5)
266 yielding a decibel quantity.

267
$$\tau = -\ln(T) = A \ln(10) \quad (3)$$

268
$$A = \frac{\ln(T)}{\ln(10)} = -\log_{10}(T) \quad (4)$$

269
$$A = -10 \log_{10}(T) \quad (5)$$

270 This definition of absorbance as a logarithmic function of transmittance is useful as it facilitates a
271 linear relationship with the optical path-length. When a linear relationship between *transmittance*
272 and *path-length* is established it then becomes theoretically easier to relate the *absorbance* to the
273 *concentration* of a suspension, which will consequently itself be a linear function.

274 The *a posteriori* description of the attenuation of light through a homogeneous medium is credited
275 to Bouguer (1729) and is also associated with Lambert. It has been called Bouguer's law, Lambert's
276 law (Lambert 1760) and the Bouguer-Lambert law. It states that the attenuation is proportional to
277 the distance travelled through the absorbing medium. The extension to this law which includes a
278 term for the concentration of absorbers is known as Beer's law, or more ubiquitously as the Beer-
279 Lambert law (Equation 6 and Equation 7), which states that the attenuation is proportional to the
280 concentration of the absorbers (Beer 1852).

The Beer-Lambert law allows the absorbance to be stated under *ideal conditions*, including the assumption that there are *no scattering processes* occurring in the sample, and that the attenuation is linear along the light path. This law enables the absorbance to be directly related to the concentration of absorbers, c , and the path length l (Equation 6). Equation 7 expresses the same quantity as a transmittance:

$$A = \varepsilon c l \quad (6) \quad T = e^{-\varepsilon c l} \quad (7)$$

where ε is the absorptivity [m^2 , or $\text{m}^2 \text{ kg}^{-1}$] of the absorbers in suspension, and is a constant dependent on the physical properties of the absorbers (i.e. dielectric properties). When defined in these terms, the *attenuation coefficient* Σ can be stated as the product of the absorptivity and the concentration of the absorbers:

$$\Sigma = \varepsilon c \quad (8)$$

Substituting Equation 8 into Equation 6 gives the absorbance in terms of the attenuation coefficient:

$$A = \Sigma l \quad (9)$$

The attenuation coefficient can be expressed in Naperian terms or as a decadic quantity (i.e. in decibels). The measured *luminance* (Cd m^{-2}) represents the *power* delivered by the transmitted light beam per unit area. In electronic design it is more common to use decadic terminology to specify measurement instrument parameters such as those used for the determination of light attenuation. If Equation 7 is substituted into Equation 5, then the absorbance can alternatively be stated in decibels (Equation 10 and Equation 11).

$$A = 10 \Sigma l \quad (10) \quad A = 10 \varepsilon c l \quad (11)$$

It is worth noting that the absorbance A is a dimensionless parameter, and the attenuation coefficient Σ has units of reciprocal length (m^{-1}). However, the absorptivity ε may have different units depending on the context in which the concentration c is expressed (Equation 11). For example, in

1
2
3 304 the case where the concentration is simply the number of absorbers N per unit volume, then the
4
5 305 units of concentration are reciprocal volume, i.e. m^{-3} or l^{-1} . Therefore, absorptivity ϵ in this instance
6
7 306 has units of m^2 . In the case of suspended sediment, the absorptivity ϵ would have units of $\text{m}^2 \text{kg}^{-1}$. It
8
9 307 is important to recognise the units stated for absorptivity, as other nomenclature could potentially
10
11 308 refer to the same physical quantity. For example, the *mass attenuation coefficient* used in chemistry
12
13 309 also has units of $\text{m}^2 \text{kg}^{-1}$. Hence it is prudent to examine the mathematical definition being used
14
15 310 within a given text to determine what physical quantity is actually being discussed, and not to rely on
16
17 311 the accuracy of the nomenclature at all. Another example of ambiguous nomenclature is highlighted
18
19 312 by Fig.4, which shows the graph of the light absorption spectrum of water. The range of this function
20
21 313 is referred to as the *absorption coefficient*, and as it has units of reciprocal length (m^{-1}) it is
22
23 314 equivalent to the Σ of this discussion (i.e. the *attenuation coefficient*). This multiplicity of
24
25 315 measurement units has the potential to cause confusion, since the absorption coefficient has *the*
26
27 316 *same units* as the attenuation coefficient Σ . This is an important point as absorption is *not the same*
28
29 317 as attenuation. Attenuation is the *end result* of the effects of the *physical properties* of the medium
30
31 318 on the *propagation* of the light waves, and represents a loss of measureable light intensity. Any
32
33 319 measured attenuation cannot be presumed to be due to absorption alone (Figure 3). Scattering of
34
35 320 light can occur in all directions, and reflection and refraction of light can also distort any attenuation
36
37 321 measurement. For example, Gumprecht & Sliepcevich (1953) suggested that *forward scattering* can
38
39 322 distort a true attenuation measurement by *adding* to the transmitted light intensity observed by a
40
41 323 detector. This forward-scattering component is referred to as the *extinction coefficient* by Clifford et
42
43 324 al. (1995, p.774), who describe it as “*the re-formation of light after scattering behind the particle*”,
44
45 325 and attribute this effect to the presence of suspended particles of diameter less than approximately
46
47 326 $4 \mu\text{m}$.
48
49
50
51
52
53 327
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

328 BAC – the beam attenuation coefficient

329 The attenuation coefficient Σ is defined for *ideal* conditions, i.e. situations in which the attenuation
330 of light obeys the Beer-Lambert law and is thus concerned with absorption only, although some
331 definitions of BAC include a term for light-scattering (Kirk 1985). However, light-absorption cannot
332 be measured directly; only the *attenuation* of a light source can be determined by direct
333 measurement of light transmitted through a sample. As this attenuation could be affected by other
334 processes besides absorption (e.g. scattering), the absorption itself is not directly observable. The
335 absorption and scattering processes that occur within the sample do not have any bearing on how a
336 transmitted light intensity is measured at a given angle with respect to the incident beam, as the
337 only available parameters are the measurement angle ϑ , and I / I_0 for each ϑ . It is crucial that the
338 BAC is accepted only as a measurement of light *attenuation*, and it cannot by itself be used to infer
339 any *a priori* mechanism of absorption or scattering. It is however conceptually convenient to
340 consider the definition of the BAC as being based purely on the effects of absorption alone (i.e. the
341 ideal conditions of the Beer-Lambert law). The measurement of transmissivity and hence the
342 attenuation of light due to the turbidity of water is referred to in the literature as *turbidimetry* or
343 *transmissometry*. The class of device for performing this measurement is consequently termed a
344 *turbidimeter* or a *transmissometer*.

345

346 A practical definition of the BAC

347 Many devices exist for the measurement of optical transmissivity in water, and in this sense the
348 word “transmissivity” is synonymous with *attenuation* and refers to the measurement of I / I_0 at an
349 angle ϑ of 0° with respect to I_0 , i.e. the “direct beam” (Figure 1). This measurement leads to the
350 derivation of the BAC by application of Equation 4, such that the BAC in decibels per metre (dB m^{-1})
351 can be stated as

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

352
$$BAC = \frac{-10 \log T}{l} \quad (12)$$

353 where *l* is the optical path length (m) as determined by the particular instrument used for the
354 measurement.

355

356 **Turbidity measurement units, calibration methods and standards**

357 **A summary of the major turbidity standards**

358 The following three standards are in common use throughout the sub-disciplines of water quality
359 assessment. Although other standards do exist, these three are the most commonly cited by
360 researchers into the properties of natural waters. The summaries of these standards are presented
361 in order to highlight some of the technical imprecision inherent in their measurement
362 methodologies.

363 **US EPA Method 180.1**

364 This standard has been in use in various revisions since the early 1970s. The most recent revision
365 being 2.0 (US EPA 1993), which states that it is applicable to the measurement of turbidity in
366 “*drinking, ground, surface, and saline waters, domestic and industrial wastes*” (US EPA 1993, p.1).
367 The standard employs the comparison between the light scattered by the test sample to the light
368 scattered by a “*standard reference suspension*” (US EPA 1993, p.1). This reference suspension
369 consists of a defined mixture of two chemicals, hydrazine sulphate and hexamethylenetetramine, to
370 produce a “*stock standard suspension*” known as Formazin (US EPA 1993, p.3). A *primary standard*
371 *suspension* is then created by diluting 10mL of stock standard in 100mL of reagent water. This
372 concentration is defined as having a turbidity of 40 Nephelometric Turbidity Units (NTU). Another

373 acceptable commercially available primary standard based on styrene divinylbenzene polymer is also
374 stated.

375 The instrumentation parameters for the measurement of scattered light by this standard are the use
376 of a tungsten light source with a colour temperature from 2200-3000K, and a beam path-length of
377 not greater than 0.1 m. The detector response should peak at 400-600 nm, and the measurement
378 angle should be $90^\circ \pm 30^\circ$. Note that this is a very broad range of light wavelengths and scattering
379 angles which encompass forward-, side- and back-scattering geometries.

380

381 ISO 7027

382 This standard has been in effect in Europe since 1994. It relies in part on the use of light scattering
383 and attenuation by standard suspensions for comparison with the same measurements in a test
384 sample, as with EPA Method 180.1. A notable difference between the two standards is that ISO 7027
385 dictates the use of near infrared light ($\lambda = 860$ nm) for all measurements. The standard suggests that
386 at wavelengths greater than 800nm the interferences caused by natural colouration of the water
387 (e.g. by dissolved humic substances) can be significantly reduced, an effect which has been observed
388 by Hongve & Akesson (1998).

389 In addition to the measurement of diffuse radiation (i.e. nephelometry) expressed in Formazin
390 Nephelometric Units (FNU – in the range 0-40), the standard also defines a method for the
391 “measurement of the attenuation of a radiant flux, more applicable to highly turbid waters (for
392 example waste or polluted waters)” (ISO 1999). This measurement is expressed in Formazin
393 Attenuation Units (FAU), in the range 40-4000 FAU.

394

395 **GLI Method 2**

This method is explicitly for the determination of turbidity in drinking water. It is a nephelometric and attenuation-based *ratio-metric* method based on infrared light of 860 nm wavelength, in common with ISO 7027. The use of dual-beam instruments that have two light sources and two detectors is specified. Each light source is pulsed sequentially, and for each measurement phase a 90° *active* intensity and a 0° *reference* intensity measurement is acquired ([Figure 6](#)). A ratio-based algorithm is then used to calculate an NTU value based on the four data points (i.e. two 0° and two 90° measurements). The accepted reason for employing this method is that it improves instrument stability due to interferences caused by the degradation of the light source, the fouling of sensor windows, and the effects of water colouration. It must be noted that the ratio algorithm is not defined in the standard, which implies that the implementation is left to the instrument designer (the topic of ratio methods is considered in greater detail later). As in the previously discussed standards, formazin suspensions are used for calibration. This is an example of a *multiple parameter* measurement method.

[insert Figure 6.]

410 A summary of turbidity measurement units

The U.S. Geological Survey has summarized currently used turbidity units and their associated standards as reproduced in Table 2 (USGS 2013), with amendments for the scattering angle convention in use throughout this paper .

[Insert Table 2]

Most of the material reviewed for this paper pertains to measurements taken by turbidity instruments that comply with either USEPA Method 180.1 or ISO 7027, and hence the measurement units that are most commonly encountered in the literature are NTU, FNU (specifically for drinking-water assessment) and FAU (specifically for waste-water assessment). The USGS considers these

units to be the ones that are most commonly applied to submersible turbidimeters. The other units listed in [Table 2](#) are rarely encountered in the turbidity literature. In addition to the USGS website, another useful summary containing greater detail regarding the applications of the different turbidimeter designs is presented by Sadar (2004). A more concise summary of the standards discussed in this paper is presented by (Ziegler 2003), and this summary is reproduced here ([Table 3](#)) as it provides pertinent and useful aid to the context of this discussion.

[Insert Table 3]

The problem with formazin

Formazin is useful as a turbidity standard as it can be reproducibly prepared from raw materials to within $\pm 1\%$, and comprises a wide range of particle shapes and sizes ranging from $0.1\ \mu\text{m}$ to $10\ \mu\text{m}$ (Buzoianu 2000). However, it also has a number of drawbacks as highlighted by Buzoianu (2000):

- The preparation temperature affects the resulting PSD.
- Formazin is carcinogenic.
- Formazin primary standards do not usually state the concentration uncertainty.
- The stability of formazin standards decreases as the concentration decreases ([Table 4](#)). The dilution ratio can be very high which leads to high uncertainty at low concentrations. This necessitates the use of secondary standards with longer shelf lives, and these standards can have poor repeatability of preparation, they are not formazin (eg latex), and they have different (narrow) PSDs. Hence, the use of secondary standards produces more variation in the response of different measurement instruments to the same nominal turbidity level.

[Insert Table 4]

It is a key fact that all of the units described in the previous section ([Table 2](#) and [Table 3](#)) are derived from a *chemical concentration level* of formazin or a secondary polymer-based standard. By this methodology an increase in concentration is defined as an increase in turbidity. *There is no defined*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

443 *relationship between the stated turbidity and the measured light intensity.* The word
444 “concentration” has effectively been replaced by “turbidity” in the definition of these measurement
445 units. For example section 7.3 of US EPA Method 180.1 states “Primary calibration standards: Mix
446 and dilute 10.00 mL of stock standard suspension (Section 7.2) to 100 mL with reagent water. **The**
447 **turbidity of this suspension is defined as 40 NTU.** For other values, mix and dilute portions of this
448 suspension as required.”

449 This definition is a serious issue as “turbidity” in these standard techniques no longer refers to an
450 optical property of water, but rather a chemical concentration of what is in terms of particle
451 classification an unknown distribution of both particle sizes and particle shapes. As the particle-size
452 distribution (PSD) is not known, it is therefore not repeatable between measurements due to factors
453 such as chemical degradation and flocculation during storage of the “stock standards”. Also, the fact
454 that it is deemed acceptable to use secondary standards that will not have the exact same optical
455 response as formazin (Sethi et al. 1997, p.110) suggests a flaw in the methodology at its root, as
456 these “stock standards” are clearly not consistent nor are they traceable.

457 The sphericity of the suspended formazin particles is also not quantified. Sadar (1999) states when
458 describing formazin “*the polymer in solution consists of random shapes and sizes.*” Both PSD (Baker
459 & Lavelle 1984, Ziegler 2003) and sphericity (Gibbs 1978) have been shown to have a significant
460 effect on the light-scattering characteristics of a suspension. Referring back to Figure 2, the
461 dimensionless size parameter x has a large effect on the scattering phase function. For example,
462 nephelometric instruments are most sensitive to particles of $<1\ \mu\text{m}$ diameter as in this size-range
463 there is a significant amount of side-scattering, yet the standards do not state the PSD limits
464 required for reference solutions.

465 It has been demonstrated that different instruments measure different turbidity values when
466 calibrated with the same primary standard, due to the differences in instrument design (Buzoianu
467 2000). This is a situation that can occur even when the different instruments are made to comply

with the same measurement standard (e.g. EPA Method 180.1), due to the wide design tolerances (e.g. a measurement angle of $90^\circ \pm 30^\circ$). In view of the large uncertainties in the concentrations (and PSDs) of the calibration standards, augmented by the variation in measurement instrument response, there is then a scenario in which *one* stock standard and *two* different measurement instruments (made to the same or different standards) could potentially give rise to not *two*, but *multiple different* initial calibration results (Figure 7). An inaccurate surrogate model of turbidity has now effectively become synonymous with turbidity itself *by definition* in these standards. This calibration problem has implications for the measurement of turbidity in the field. The cross-comparability of measurements made by different researchers at different sites using different instrumentation is now questionable, even if each researcher has a self-consistent set of repeatable calibration data for their own particular measurement instrument. It is therefore necessary to take a step back and to re-define the chain of measurement at its first and weakest link, which is the Formazin standard, and to establish a new methodology based purely on the calibration of measurement instruments to well-defined light intensities at well-defined wavelengths.

[insert Figure 7.]

Towards a new turbidity instrumentation standard

In order to move towards a new standard for the design of turbidity instrumentation it is first necessary to take a step back from the accepted suspension-based calibration methods as prescribed by the existing standards. The following discussion attempts to clarify the misconceptions associated with the relationship between SSC, TSS and turbidity, and leads on to a proposed calibration methodology based on the measurement of light-attenuation due to the presence of optical neutral density (ND) filters in the optical beam path. To complete the new standard, a new nomenclature based on the BAC is proposed for the reporting of turbidity at multiple scattering angles and wavelengths of light. To conclude the discussion, some suggestions for the contents of

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

potential secondary standards (based on the newly proposed instrumentation standard) for surrogate SSC determination are then outlined briefly.

Suspended sediment concentration (SSC) and total suspended solids (TSS): their relationship with turbidity and the importance of the PSD

The surrogacy of physical properties for intrinsic optical properties as is the case regarding *chemical concentration* becoming a surrogate for *optical turbidity* has raised the possibility of further misinterpretation, due to the undefined PSD of the calibration standards and the inconsistent response of different measurement instruments to the same PSD (Buzoianu 2000). In this section it is necessary to take a step back from turbidity to examine the meanings of the pre-existing terminology for suspensions (of sediment or otherwise) in water. It is important to understand this terminology as the descriptive acronyms actually refer to documented test methods for the determination of sediment concentration and suspended solids concentration. An understanding of these methods will then facilitate a deeper appreciation of the reasons for the conceptual conflation of sediment concentration with turbidity.

The US convention regarding the attribution of documented test methods to the acronyms “SSC” and “TSS” has been adopted in this paper. Regarding this terminology, as with that of turbidity, the differences in use in different disciplinary areas arises again. For example Holliday et al. (2003) suggest TSS to mean “total suspended sediment concentration”, rather than “total suspended solids”, i.e. the acronym SSC may have been a better choice.

The field techniques and laboratory methods for the measurement of SSC and TSS were reviewed by Gray et al. (2000), who cite Method D 3977-97 (ASTM 1998) for SSC and Method 2540 D (APHA 1971) for TSS. They describe the two different analytical methods as follows:

- SSC data are produced by measuring the dry weight of all the sediment from a known volume of a water-sediment mixture.

- TSS data are produced by several methods, most of which entail measuring the dry weight of sediment from a known volume of a subsample of the original.

After an analysis of 3235 paired SSC and TSS measurements was performed, it was concluded that SSC was the more reliable methodology (Gray et al. 2000), especially when the amount of sand in a sample exceeds approximately one quarter of the dry sediment mass. The main reason given for this disparity of results is that the SSC analytical method utilises the entire sample (including all sediment present), whereas the TSS methods typically involve the analysis of only a sub-sampled aliquot of the total sample. The decanting and pipetting techniques employed to obtain this aliquot do not capture a complete representation of the sediment population of the original sample. The resulting subsample is therefore sediment deficient, particularly of the larger sand-sized sediment fraction. Gray et al. (2000) go on to suggest that the reason for this loss of sediment during TSS analysis arises from the fact that TSS methods were originally designed for analysis of waste-water samples that were to be collected *after* an initial settling phase, hence larger sediment particles were never intended to be part of the analysis. They finally conclude that SSC and TSS analysis of natural water samples are not comparable, and that SSC is the only viable method for the determination of the sediment concentration of natural waters.

In order to relate a subjective turbidity reading to a real physical property such as SSC, a calibration procedure is typically performed. This relationship between the optical properties of suspended sediment and its mass concentration must therefore be understood, requiring the characterisation of its lithology. The size of the sediment particle is frequently measured either directly (e.g. filtering and sieving), or analytically (by LASER diffraction) in the case of smaller size fractions. LASER-based particle size measurements give a *volume* concentration value, which then requires further knowledge of the specific density and mineralogy of the sample in order for an estimate of the *mass* concentration to be obtained. This process is known as *end-member calibration*.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The problem now arises that the detector response has been pre-calibrated to a primary standard, with arbitrary units for turbidity based on unstable calibration methods. It has already been suggested (Figure 7) that these units (NTU etc.) are not comparable between calibrations made on instruments constructed to the same standard. It is therefore highly unlikely that calibrations made by *different* instruments (constructed to the same or different standards) can ever be accurately compared due to the invalidity of these extrinsic turbidity units. It is therefore necessary to determine the true instrument response by a different method entirely. Only then can an end-member calibration have any chance of being meaningful.

Optical neutral density filters (ND filters) are regularly employed for the calibration of transmission-based optical instruments, but are seldom employed in turbidimetry or nephelometry. These filters provide a consistent optical density (OD) which in turn will attenuate a well-defined percentage of the transmitted light. One such example of an attempt to calibrate a turbidimeter against a known light attenuator is Finlayson (1985). By not only calibrating a turbidimeter against Formazin suspension, but also against ND filters, Finlayson has devised a method by which direct comparison between attenuation measurements made on the same sample by different devices could potentially be developed. It can be seen that Formazin concentration does not in fact have a linear relationship to measured light attenuation (Figure 8). Although the calibration data are sparse in the upper range of the instrument in this case (Finlayson 1985), there is a good fit of the data to a power law ($R^2 = 0.9954$). The only two useful axes on this graph are “meter reading” and “neutral density filters”, as these two alone are all that is required to accurately establish the response of the instrument to attenuation (Figure 9). Only when this detector attenuation curve has been established can further selective end-member calibrations be performed to determine the effect the PSD has on the response of a particular instrument to a given sediment. Each ND filter represents an optical density, d , which is directly equivalent to the absorbance A , as in Equation 4. So in order to calculate the BAC in dB m^{-1} for an instrument with path-length l , the following equation can be applied (Equation 13):

$$BAC = \frac{10 d}{l} = \frac{10 ND}{l} \quad (13)$$

[insert Figure 8.]

[insert Figure 9.]

Instrumentation parameters and calibration methods

To arrive at a *consistent* methodology for the measurement of turbidity it is necessary to accept that the only quantity that can be readily measured optically in this context is the transmitted light intensity, and hence *attenuation* with respect to the light source (i.e. I/I_0). It is the methodology for taking this measurement that should be rigorously specified, regardless of the measurement angle ϑ with respect to I_0 . The implementation section of the standard should address this methodology, and focus purely on the desired response of the instrument to light at defined intensities and wavelengths. This aspect of work would involve the definition of parameters such as sensor type, variable intensity light source specification (including coherence and polarization), detector amplifier gains and ranges, ND filter calibration procedure involving multiple beam paths, beam path-length and collimation arrangements. It is then necessary to decide which instrument parameters (e.g. ϑ , λ and I) should be specified as mandatory for all turbidity measuring instruments, and which ones should be considered as being application-specific.

The reporting of turbidity measurement data

The standardization of the reporting of turbidity as attenuation data (Ziegler 2003) and the use of a more descriptive nomenclature is proposed, which will allow for the easy identification of application-specific data such that incompatible measurements will not be inadvertently compared to each other. It is suggested that significant progress could be made if the measurement concepts for turbidimetry and nephelometry were unified, i.e. by treating them *both* as an attenuation

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

589 process. The only difference being that for scattered light measurement the effective concentration
590 of scatterers is *inversely proportional* to the BAC measured at a specific angle to the incident beam.
591 However, for that to be achieved formulations of the BAC at specific angles must then be defined,
592 for example BAC_0 for a standard transmissivity measurement and BAC_{90} for the nephelometric
593 counterpart at 90° . For the nephelometric case the relationship between the scattered light intensity
594 and the concentration could be viewed as an *inverse attenuation*, since a higher concentration of
595 particles will produce stronger scattering (until the concentration is too high, at which point
596 multiple-scattering and grain-shielding will dominate and interfere with the measurement of the
597 side-scattered light). Measurement-instrument calibration now becomes somewhat critical, as any
598 drift in the incident light intensity or the sensor response will affect the sensitivity of the system to
599 the low light intensities that need to be detected due to side- or back-scattering. This nephelometric
600 BAC_{90} measurement results in potentially larger percentage errors than those that are likely for
601 measurements based on BAC_0 , as greater electronic amplification is required to detect the weaker
602 scattered-light signal which can be inherently noisy. In order to formulate a generic equation for the
603 BAC as a function of measurement angle it is necessary to include two terms: one for attenuation
604 and one for scattering. The use of these terms is in no way a new idea (e.g. Kirk 1985), however the
605 interpretation of scattered light intensity as an *inverse absorbance* has not been previously
606 considered. In this new method the same measurement units could be employed for practical
607 comparison between data obtained under different conditions using different instruments, so long
608 as those instruments complied with the same instrumentation standard, and the reporting of said
609 data is consistent (Ziegler 2003). For example Kirk (1985) suggested using the correct description of
610 the measurement method, such as “side-scattering”, when stating results – or preferably BAC_{90} in
611 this case.

612

Standards for surrogate SSC determination

Further standards for the determination of surrogate properties such as SSC should refer to instruments that are specified according to the new instrumentation standard. In order to estimate SSC accurately, optical instruments must be capable of producing data rich enough to facilitate suspended sediment characterization. Methods for the determination of the PSD (and other properties) of a suspended sediment by multi-parameter measurements need to be developed, which could include the use of LASER diffraction techniques. Other potential methods of sediment characterization should also be explored more thoroughly.

Suspended sediment characterization

For a deeper understanding of sediment transport to be realized, it is essential to know how the different size-classes of sediment respond to different flow conditions, especially the larger sand-sized particles that can be transiently in suspension long enough to affect turbidity measurements. A knowledge of sediment particle shape in terms of *sphericity* and *roundness* can also provide an insight into the distance travelled by sediment particles that have previously been entrained in a flow of water. There is a clear need therefore to characterize the suspended sediment to determine the particle sizes present. This characterization can be achieved by traditional gravimetric sampling methods, but there is an increasing need to gather data for research purposes *in-situ* and quickly. In some cases, these measurements could be made “off-line” by optical means, which would still be much faster than can be achieved by gravimetric methods. LASER-based optical measurements are the most commonly employed for this purpose, although there have been attempts to derive particle-size information from multi-parameter turbidity measurements. The effect that particle shape has on such measurements could also be exploited as a characterization technique.

Measurement ratios and multi-parameter method development

The designers of some turbidity meters (i.e. any commercially available instrument that claims compliance with GLI Method 2) have adopted the use of multi-parameter measurements in order to improve instrument performance. This innovation has included the measurement of light intensities at multiple scattering angles, and the use of the ratios of those intensities to infer some of the physical properties of the scattering suspension, e.g. sphericity (Gibbs 1978), or to negate the effect of water colour as an interference to the turbidity measurement (Lawler 2005, Lambrou et al. 2009). An example of another multi-parameter approach to turbidity measurement is presented by Yang & Hogg (1979), wherein two different wavelengths of light are used to predict the PSD of the scattering suspension. These and other multi-parameter approaches to turbidity measurement should be the focus of further research, and will aid the development of new turbidity standards.

Conclusions

1. The use of turbidity purely as an indicator of water clarity is entirely acceptable assuming the development of more consistent standards. The problem is that the existing standards have introduced a set of measurement units that actually represent a surrogate for turbidity and therefore cannot be used to describe water clarity.
2. Simple turbidity measurements when used as a surrogate for suspended sediment concentration are only viable under highly constrained conditions. Bias toward the fine sediment fraction is usually considered unimportant, but this is not always the case.
3. Sand-sized sediment fractions are not consistently accounted for by existing turbidity measurements, due to their high settling velocities. The SSC method is also required in order to quantify the sand fraction fully.
4. The development of new light-scattering models will permit more sophisticated approaches to turbidity measurement, in particular by the use of parameter-rich data sets obtainable

- 660 from multi-parameter methods. This approach will facilitate the improvement of turbidity
 661 standards, and could increase the accuracy of large sediment particle detection.
- 662 5. A new turbidity instrumentation standard needs to be drafted, based purely on the principle
 663 of attenuation for calibration and reporting purposes. It should specify the reporting of the
 664 BAC in dB m^{-1} (or derived units) for a range of measurement angles and wavelengths of light.
 665 This standard should be a root standard from which other secondary standards are derived,
 666 e.g. standards for suspended sediment characterisation or total suspended solids
 667 assessment by optical turbidity measurement.
- 668 6. A further standard for suspended sediment determination by simple multi-parameter
 669 turbidity measurements needs to be devised (leading on from point 4 above). This standard
 670 should include basic sediment characterisation as an outcome of optical turbidity
 671 measurements (e.g. PSD and sphericity).

672 References

- 673 Agrawal, Y.C., Whitmire, A., Mikkelsen, O.A. & Pottsmith, H.C., 2008. Light scattering by random
 674 shaped particles and consequences on measuring suspended sediments by laser diffraction.
 675 *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 113(C4), p.C04023. Available at:
 676 <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1029/2007JC004403> [Accessed February 12, 2015].
- 677 APHA, 1971. Standard methods for the examination of water and wastewater (13th ed.): Method
 678 2540 D, Total Suspended Solids Dried at 103°– 105° C. *American Public Health Association,*
 679 *American Water Works Association, and Water Pollution Control Federation.*
- 680 ASTM, 1998. ASTM D3977 - 97 Standard Test Methods for Determining Sediment Concentration in
 681 Water Samples. *American Society for Testing and Materials*, 11.02, pp.395–400.
- 682 Baker, E.T. & Lavelle, J.W., 1984. The Effect of Particle Size on the Light Attenuation Coefficient of
 683 Natural Suspensions. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 89(C5), pp.8197–8203.
- 684 Beer, 1852. Bestimmung der Absorption des rothen Lichts in farbigen Flüssigkeiten. *Annalen der*
 685 *Physik und Chemie.*, 86, pp.78–88.
- 686 Bilotta, G.S. & Brazier, R.E., 2008. Understanding the influence of suspended solids on water quality
 687 and aquatic biota. *Water research*, 42(12), pp.2849–61. Available at:
 688 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18462772> [Accessed November 18, 2013].
- 689 Bilro, L., Prats, S.A., Pinto, J.L., Keizer, J.J. & Nogueira, R.N., 2010. Design and performance
 690 assessment of a plastic optical fibre-based sensor for measuring water turbidity. *Measurement*
 691 *Science and Technology*, 21(10), p.107001. Available at: <http://stacks.iop.org/0957->

1
2
3 692 0233/21/i=10/a=107001 [Accessed August 24, 2014].
4
5 693 Bouguer, P., 1729. Essai d'optique, Sur la gradation de la lumière. *Claude Jombert*, p.164 ff.
6
7 694 Buzoianu, M., 2000. Practical considerations on the traceability to conventional scales. *Accreditation*
8 695 *and Quality Assurance*, 5(4), pp.142–150. Available at:
9 696 <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s007690050433> [Accessed April 21, 2017].
10
11 697 Clifford, N.J., Richards, K.S., Brown, R.A. & Lane, S.N., 1995. Laboratory and field assessment of an
12 698 infrared turbidity probe and its response to particle size and variation in suspended sediment
13 699 concentration. *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, 40(6), pp.771–791.
14
15 700 Davies-Colley, R.J. & Smith, D.G., 2001. Turbidity, suspended sediment, and water clarity: a review.
16 701 *Journal of the American Water Resources Association*, 37(5), pp.1085–1101.
17
18 702 Finlayson, B.L., 1985. Field calibration of a recording turbidity meter. *Catena*, 12(2–3), pp.141–147.
19 703 Available at: <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/0341816285900062>.
20
21 704 Fugate, D.C. & Friedrichs, C.T., 2002. Determining concentration and fall velocity of estuarine particle
22 705 populations using ADV, OBS and LISST. *Continental Shelf Research*, 22(11–13), pp.1867–1886.
23 706 Available at: <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0278434302000432>.
24
25 707 Gibbs, R.J., 1978. Light scattering from particles of different shapes. *Journal of Geophysical Research*,
26 708 83(C1), p.501. Available at: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1029/JC083iC01p00501>.
27
28 709 Gippel, C.J., 1989. The use of turbidimeters in suspended sediment research. *Hydrobiologia*, 176–
29 710 177(1), pp.465–480. Available at: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/BF00026582>.
30
31 711 Gray, J.R., Glysson, G.D., Turcios, L.M. & Schwarz, G.E., 2000. Comparability of suspended-solids
32 712 concentration and total suspended solids data. In US Department, of the Interior, US Geological
33 713 Survey.
34
35 714 Gumprecht, R.O. & Sliepcevich, C.M., 1953. Measurement of particle sizes in polydispersed systems
36 715 by means of light transmission measurements combined with differential settling. *Journal of*
37 716 *Physical Chemistry*, 57(1), pp.95–97.
38
39 717 Holliday, C.P., Rasmussen, T.C. & Miller, W.P., 2003. Establishing the relationship between turbidity
40 718 and total suspended sediment concentration. , pp.1–3.
41
42 719 Hongve, D. & Akesson, G., 1998. Comparison of nephelometric turbidity measurements using
43 720 wavelengths 400–600 and 860 nm. *Water research*, 32(10), pp.3143–3145.
44
45 721 Van De Hulst, H., 1957. *Light scattering by small particles*, Dover Pubns. Available at:
46 722 http://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=PIHfPMVAFRC&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=light+scattering+by+small+particles&ots=Ge0bKwppla&sig=QAVu3sO5nggAw_-4F51qDxF9ajs.
47 723
48
49 724 ISO, 1999. *ISO 7027:1999 Water quality - determination of turbidity*, Available at:
50 725 www.iso.org/iso/catalogue_detail.htm?csnumber=30123.
51
52 726 Jansson, M.B., 1992. Turbidimeter measurements in a tropical river, Costa Rica. In *Erosion and*
53 727 *Sediment Transport Monitoring Programmes in River Basins (Proceedings of the Oslo*
54 728 *Symposium, August 1992)*. pp. 71–78.
55
56 729 Kerr, S.J., 1995. *Silt , Turbidity and Suspended Sediments in the Aquatic Environment : an annotated*
57 730 *bibliography and literature review.*,
58
59
60

- 731 Kirk, J.T.O., 1985. Effects of suspensoids (turbidity) on penetration of solar radiation in aquatic
732 ecosystems. *Hydrobiologia*, 125, pp.195–208.
- 733 Lambert, J.H., 1760. Lamberts Photometrie : [Photometria, sive De mensura et gradibus luminus,
734 colorum et umbrae]. *Leipzig : W. Engelmann*, p.433. Available at:
735 <https://archive.org/details/lambertsphotome00lambgoog> [Accessed April 22, 2017].
- 736 Lambrou, T.P., Anastasiou, C.C. & Panayiotou, C.G., 2009. A Nephelometric Turbidity System for
737 Monitoring Residential Drinking Water Quality. In *Sensor Applications, Experimentation, and*
738 *Logistics : First International Conference, SENSAPPEAL 2009, Athens, Greece, September 25,*
739 *2009, Revised Selected Papers*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 43–55.
- 740 Lawler, D.M., 2005. Turbidimetry and Nephelometry. *Water*, pp.343–351.
- 741 Lelli, L., 2014. Aerosol and Clouds WS2014 - Scattering Regimes. , p.47. Available at:
742 http://www.iup.uni-bremen.de/~luca/?download=01_LL_VO.pdf.
- 743 Liu, Y., Arnott, W.P. & Hallett, J., 1998. Anomalous diffraction theory for arbitrarily oriented finite
744 circular cylinders and comparison with exact T-matrix results. *Applied Optics*, 37(21), pp.5019–
745 5030.
- 746 Mie, G., 1908. Contributions to the optics of turbid media, particularly of colloidal metal solutions.
747 *Ann. Phys.*, 25, pp.377–445. Available at: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/andp.19083300302>.
- 748 Moosmüller, H. & Arnott, W.P., 2009. Particle optics in the Rayleigh regime. *Journal of the Air &*
749 *Waste Management Association (1995)*, 59(9), pp.1028–31. Available at:
750 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19785268> [Accessed April 21, 2017].
- 751 Pope, R.M. & Fry, E.S., 1997. Absorption spectrum (380–700 nm) of pure water. II. Integrating cavity
752 measurements. *Applied optics*, 36, pp.8710–8723.
- 753 Rice, E.W., Sethi, V., Patnaik, P., Biswas, P. & Clark, R.M., 1997. Evaluation of optical detection
754 methods for waterborne suspensions. *American Water Works Association.*, 89(2), pp.98–112.
- 755 Sadar, M., 2004. Making Sense of Turbidity Measurements – Advantages In Establishing Traceability
756 Between Measurements and Technology. In *National Monitoring Conference, Chattanooga, TN,*
757 *USA*. p. 10.
- 758 Sadar, M., 1999. *Turbidimeter Instrument Comparison: Low-level Sample Measurements*, Available
759 at: <http://www.hach.com/asset-get.download-en.jsa?code=61798>.
- 760 Slattery, M.C. & Burt, T.P., 1997. Particle size characteristics of suspended sediment in hillslope
761 runoff and stream flow. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 22, pp.705–719.
- 762 Strutt, J.W., 1871. On the Light from the Sky, its Polarization and Colour. *Philosophical Magazine*, XLI,
763 pp.107–120, 274–279.
- 764 Sutherland, T., Lane, P., Amos, C. & Downing, J., 2000. The calibration of optical backscatter
765 sensors for suspended sediment of varying darkness levels. *Marine Geology*, 162(2–4), pp.587–
766 597. Available at: <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0025322799000808>.
- 767 US EPA, 1993. *Method 180.1 determination of turbidity by nephelometry*,
- 768 USGS, 2013. Units of Measurement for Turbidity Sensors. Available at:
769 <http://or.water.usgs.gov/grapher/fnu.html>.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60


770 Williams, N.D., Walling, D.E. & Leeks, G.J.L., 2007. High temporal resolution in situ measurement of
771 the effective particle size characteristics of fluvial suspended sediment. *Water research*, 41(5),
772 pp.1081–93. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17215017> [Accessed
773 November 26, 2013].

774 Yang, K.C. & Hogg, R., 1979. Estimation of Particle Size Distributions from Turbidimetric
775 Measurements. *Analytical Chemistry*, 51(6), pp.758–763.


776 Ziegler, A.C., 2003. Issues related to use of turbidity measurements as a surrogate for suspended
777 sediment. , (Circular 1250), pp.16–18.

778


For Peer Review




134x96mm (300 x 300 DPI)




93x110mm (600 x 600 DPI)




78x45mm (600 x 600 DPI)




103x72mm (600 x 600 DPI)




96x69mm (600 x 600 DPI)




66x31mm (600 x 600 DPI)



88x52mm (300 x 300 DPI)





85x54mm (600 x 600 DPI)

Review

	Scattering-regime and scattering-angle referenced in the text.		
Reference	Transmitted	Back-scattered	Forward-scattered
Agrawal et al. (2008)	Implied 0°		<10°
Bilro et al. (2010)	180°		
Campbell et al. (2005)		180°	
Fugate & Friedrichs (2002)		Angle not defined	
Green & Boon (1993)		>150°	
Guillén et al. (2000)		Angle not defined	
Gumprecht & Sliepcevic (1953)	Angle not defined		
Jansson (1992)	Implied 0°		12°
Morais et al. (2006)	Angle not defined		
Pavanelli & Bigi (2005)		90°	
Sadar (2004, Fig.4, p.8)	180°		
Sadar (2004, Fig.5, p.9)	Implied 0°	140°	
Xu (1997)		Angle not defined	
Yang & Hogg (1979)	Angle not defined		

Units of Measurement for Turbidity Sensors		
	Wavelength of Light Source	
	White or broadband: peak spectral output of 400-680 nm	Infrared, monochromatic: typical output in 780-900 nm range
Single Illumination Beam Light Source		
90° to incident beam; single detector	Nephelometric Turbidity Unit (NTU) ^a	Formazin Nephelometric Unit (FNU) ^b
90° and other angles; multiple detectors; instrument algorithms use combination of detector readings and ratio techniques	Nephelometric Turbidity Ratio Unit (NTRU)	Formazin Nephelometric Ratio Unit (FNRU)
30°±15° to incident beam (backscatter)	Backscatter Unit (BU)	Formazin Backscatter Unit (FBU)
30°±15° and other angles; multiple detectors; instrument algorithms use combination of detector readings and ratio techniques	Backscatter Ratio Unit (BRU)	Formazin Backscatter Ratio Unit (FBRU)
0° to incident beam (attenuation)	Attenuation Unit (AU)	Formazin Attenuation Unit (FAU)
Multiple Illumination Beam Light Source		
90° and possibly other angles; multiple detectors; instrument algorithms use combination of detector readings	Nephelometric Turbidity Multibeam Unit (NTMU)	Formazin Nephelometric Multibeam Unit (FNMU)
^a NTU: limited to instruments that comply with EPA Method 180.1. ^b FNU: pertains to instruments that comply with ISO 7027, the European drinking-water protocol. This includes many of the most commonly used submersible turbidimeters.		

Characteristic	USEPA Method 180.1 (non-ratio mode)	ISO Method 7027 (diffuse radiation)	ISO Method 7027 (attenuated radiation)	GLI Method 2
Use of data	Drinking water	Drinking water	Wastewater	Drinking water
Range of method	0-40 NTU (dilution permitted)	0-40 FTU (dilution permitted)	40-4000 FAU	0-40 NTU (dilution permitted)
Light source	Tungsten lamp	Photodiode	Photodiode	Photodiode
Wavelength	400-600 nm	860 nm	860 nm	860 nm
Spectral bandwidth	Not specified	60 nm	60 nm	60 nm
Detector orientation measurement angle	90° ± 30°	90° ± 2.5°	90° ± 2.5°	Two sources, two detectors at 90° ± 2.5°
Aperture angle	Not specified	20°-30°	20°-30°	Unknown
Path length	Less than 0.1 m	Less than 0.1 m	Less than 0.1 m	Less than 0.1 m
Primary standards	Formazin polymer	Formazin polymer	Formazin polymer	Formazin polymer
Secondary standards	Polymer microspheres	Polymer microspheres	Polymer microspheres, cubes, or filaments	Polymer microspheres

Formazin standard concentration	Stability duration
> 400 NTU	1 year
20 – 400 NTU	1 month
2 – 20 NTU	12 – 24 hours
< 2 NTU	<= 1 hour
<= 1 NTU	Difficult to prepare accurately

- Figure 1 Illustrations of the light-scattering angle convention: the “direct beam” where $I_{\vartheta} = I$, forward-scattering, side-scattering and back-scattering. The incident beam is denoted I_0 and the direct transmitted beam at 0° to the incident beam is denoted I . The scattered beams are denoted I_{ϑ} , where ϑ is the scattering angle with respect to the incident beam.
- Figure 2 Scattering phase functions derived from Mie theory, with light incident from the left of the diagrams. Forward scattering becomes more pronounced as x increases.
- Figure 3 The scattering processes of reflection, refraction and diffraction, and the attenuation process of absorption of light due to a particle suspended in water.
- Figure 4 Light scattering theory regimes as a function of particle diameter and wavelength of light. Also shown are sediment particle size bands according to the American Geophysical Union Sediment Classification System.
- Figure 5 The light absorption spectrum of water. After Hale & Querry (1973) and Pope & Fry (1997).
- Figure 6 Beam-ratio process as described in GLI Method 2. LS 1 & LS 2 are the light sources; D1 and D2 are the detectors. I_0 is the light beam incident on the sample; I_{ACTIVE} is the 90° scattered light and is considered to be the actual nephelometric measurement; I_{REF} is the 0° transmitted light and is used purely as a reference value for use in a ratio-metric calculation.
- Figure 7 An example of the effect of indeterminate PSD due to identically defined but potentially physically dissimilar primary turbidity standards on the calibration of turbidity instruments. Results are further confounded by the variability in response between different instruments to the same PSD.

Figure 8 Laboratory calibration of a turbidity meter with Formazin standards. Meter readings of the neutral density filters used in the field are shown also (Finlayson 1985).

Figure 9 A reproduction of the data contained in Figure 8 showing the meter reading vs. the ND filter value (after Finlayson 1985). The ND value is equivalent to d , the optical density.

For Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1	A selection of turbidity literature references illustrating the ambiguity associated with the assignment of scattering-regime nomenclature to the actual scattering-angle.
Table 2	Units of Measurement for Turbidity Sensors, after USGS website (USGS 2013).
Table 3	Summary of turbidity test methods after Ziegler (2003), where NTU are nephelometric turbidity units, FTU are formazin turbidity units, and FAU are farmazin attenuation units.
Table 4	Stability of formazin standards, after Buzoianu (2000).